DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 520 EA 031 895

AUTHOR	Winter, Paul A.; Jaeger, Mary Grace
TITLE	An Experimental Investigation of Principal Selection Decisions Made by Teachers Serving on School Councils.
PUB DATE	2002-08-00
NOTE	39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (Burlington, VT, August 5-10, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; *Personnel Evaluation; *Personnel Management; Personnel Policy; *Personnel Selection; *Principals; *School Councils; Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Public school teachers (N=189) role-played as members of school councils making principal selection decisions by rating simulated candidates for principal vacancies. The independent variables were principal candidate job experience, candidate person characteristics (communication, management, instructional leadership), and teacher school level. The dependent variable was teacher rating of the job candidate. A three-way ANOVA detected a significant main effect ($F [2, 162] = 7.34$, $p < .001$) for candidate job experience. Teachers rated the most experienced candidates higher than the least experienced candidates, but failed to rate the medium experienced candidate higher than the least experienced candidate or the most experienced candidate higher than the medium experienced candidate. The findings from this investigation should cause school reformers to revisit personnel policies with respect to principal selection. Study results strongly suggest that teachers on school councils, who lack administrative experience in the personnel function, have difficulty making optimal principal selection decisions that will maximally benefit the school. Results of such poor decision-making can jeopardize school performance and school reform. This study uncovered new knowledge about principal selection and did so using an innovative simulation approach that may serve to guide future selection investigations. (Contains 46 references and 3 tables.) (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 520

An Experimental Investigation of Principal Selection Decisions Made by Teachers Serving on School Councils

Paul A. Winter

University of Louisville

Mary Grace Jaeger

Jefferson County Public Schools

Correspondence to:

Paul A. Winter

University of Louisville

College of Education and Human Development

Education Building, Room #335

Louisville, KY 40292

Phone: (502) 852-0617

Fax: (502) 852-4563

E-mail: winter@louisville.edu

Paper presented at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), August 5-10, 2002, Burlington, VT.

EA 031 895

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. WINTER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Public school teachers (N = 189) role-played as members of school councils making principal selection decisions by rating simulated candidates for principal vacancies. The independent variables were principal candidate job experience, candidate person characteristics (communication, management, instructional leadership), and teacher school level. The dependent variable was teacher rating of the job candidate. A three-way ANOVA detected a significant main effect (F [2, 162] = 7.34, p < .001) for candidate job experience. Teachers rated the most experienced candidates higher than the least experienced candidates, but failed to rate the medium experienced candidate higher than the least experienced candidate or the most experienced candidate higher than the medium experienced candidate. Implications are discussed relative to the practice of teachers selecting principals, selection theory, and future research.

An Experimental Investigation of Principal Selection Decisions Made by Teachers Serving on School Councils

Recruiting and selecting qualified school principals has become a national crisis (Bowles, 1990; Educational Research Service, 1998; Fenwick, 2000; McAdams, 1998; McCormick, 1987; Pounder & Merrill, 2001). The pools of qualified applicants for position vacancies are shrinking. Also, the decline in qualified applicants is occurring at a time of massive principal retirements among members of the post-World War II "baby boom" generation (National Association of Elementary and Secondary School Principals, 1998). The US Department of Labor estimates that, while school administrator employment will increase by 20% by the year 2008, 40% of the nation's principals are nearing retirement. There is also growing evidence that the number of public school educators interested in becoming a principal is decreasing because the job has become less attractive, especially in school districts undergoing systemic school reform. The decreasing attractiveness of the principalship is also due, in part, to the growing complexity of the job and the high accountability demanded of principals in terms of improving student achievement (Murphy & Beck, 1994).

Further, in reform states such as Kentucky, site-based decision-making councils complicate the task of attracting qualified educators to fill principal vacancies by mandating (Kentucky Education Reform Act, 1990) that teachers and parents on school councils participate in principal selection decisions. In Kentucky, councils composed of the principal, three teachers, and two parents govern schools. The teachers and parents are elected by their peers and serve one-year terms. When the position of principal is vacant, teachers and parents on councils select the new principal from a slate of qualified candidates provided by the district superintendent (Kentucky Revised Statues, 1995).

Whether or not teachers and parents are technically capable of making principal selection decisions is open to question. In her research about school councils in Kentucky, David (1994) found that personnel decisions, particularly decisions associated with the task of filling position vacancies, are among the most difficult decisions faced by teachers and parents on school councils. Placing the administrative task of principal selection in the hands of individuals lacking experience in personnel management is a practice that should be re-examined by policy makers and school reformers. As Pounder and Young (1996) observed:

> Effective recruitment and selection of school administrators continues to be one of the more challenging human resource administration functions in educational organizations. This challenge is due, in part, to the inexact 'science' of attracting, screening, and identifying quality candidates to fit the complex leadership needs of schools today. Factors such as recent educational initiatives, new conceptualizations of leadership, and changing student characteristics are influencing the position demands of administrative roles. (p. 279)

Purpose

Despite the importance of principal selection, there has been little empirical research about this administrative task (Pounder & Merrill, 2001; Pounder & Young, 1996). Almost nothing is known about the personnel decisions made by teachers serving on school councils. Winter, McCabe, and Newton (1998) performed one of the few empirical studies about teachers on school councils making principal selection decisions and found bias among teachers making such decisions. Their findings included: (a) teachers participating in principal selection decisions preferred principal candidates with whom they shared a dominant work value, (b) elementary and middle school

teachers preferred candidates oriented toward instructional leadership, and (c) high school teachers preferred candidates oriented toward school management. The conclusion these investigators drew concerning the above job orientation-by-school level interaction was:

> The existence of a principal job attributes by school level interaction would appear to be problematic in that teachers and parents who lack administrative experience, and may not view themselves as administrators, are called upon to act in an administrative capacity. If teachers involved in selecting a principal exhibit undue preference for either managerial or instructional leadership attributes of the principalship, this may not be appropriate given that best administrative practice requires principals to have a broad base of both managerial and instructional leadership skills. (Winter et al., 1998, p. 274)

Further evidence that school councils may not be the most effective decision-making bodies for selecting principals emerged from a case study performed by Watkins (1991) in Australia. Watkins found school councils were biased against female job candidates and older candidates with greater job experience.

Given the scarcity of research about teachers making principal selection decisions, the purpose of this investigation was to examine factors that potentially influence the principal selection decisions made by teachers serving on school councils. The factors examined were the job experience of the principal candidate, the candidate's characteristics as depicted on a superintendent candidate summary, and teacher school assignment level. The study participants were public school teachers randomly selected from a large group of volunteers working in four school districts in Kentucky.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework adopted for this research was the personnel selection model developed by Dipboye (1992). This model highlights the pre-interview stage of the selection process when representatives of the hiring organization make initial screening decisions based on written information about the job candidate. The Dipboye model postulates that initial screening decisions are critical to the hiring process. The representatives of the hiring organization screen job candidates in or out of the selection process based on initial impressions gained from written information such as application forms, job candidate summaries, and reference letters. Consequently,

initial selection decisions, based on written information, impact which individuals are invited to interview for the job and hired to fill the position.

In this study, teachers role-played as members of school councils making principal selection decisions based on written candidate summaries provided by the district superintendent, an externally valid procedure consistent with policies operant at the research sites. At the research sites, superintendents pre-screen applicants for principal vacancies and forward a slate of qualified candidates, frequently with candidate summaries, to teachers and parents on school councils who make the ultimate principal selection decision. If the teachers and parents making the principal selection decision are not satisfied with the candidates provided by the superintendent, they have the authority to request additional candidates from the superintendent (Kentucky Revised Statues, 1995; Lindle & Shrock, 1993). Because teachers on councils have the personnel selection authority described above, this study represents an important step towards determining if teachers are administratively competent to make such decisions that potentially impact school performance. Knowledge about teacher involvement in

principal selection decisions, especially in reform states like Kentucky, is vital because

> A poor principal selection can often destroy an entire decade of progress, or hamper educational improvement for years. An ineffective teacher may damage a classroom of students, but an ineffective principal may damage an entire generation of young people. (Richardson & Prickett, 1990, p. 6)

Methods

This study was a factorial experiment (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) involving a simulation with teachers role-playing as members of school councils making principal selection decisions according to procedures mandated by school reform legislation (Kentucky Education Reform Act, 1990). The study design was a 3 x 3 x 3, completely crossed, fixed-factor analysis of variance (Kirk, 1990) with 27 equal cells (n = 7).

Participants

The focal population for this research was all certified public school teachers from four districts representing four geographic regions (North, South, East, West) of Kentucky, a state where school councils constitute the school governance component of a statewide systemic school reform program. The study participants were

elementary, middle school, and high school teachers (N = 189) selected at random from a large group of individuals who volunteered to participant in the study. The sample size derived from a power analysis conducted according to procedures recommended by Cohen (1988). The power analysis parameters were: (a) a specified alpha level (α = .05), (b) a planned power level (β = .80), and (c) a medium effect size (ω^2 = .06). In his review of effect sizes for research involving ANOVA, Keppel (1991, p. 74) characterized ω^2 = .06 as a "medium" effect size. Descriptive data for the study participants appear in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Independent Variables

The independent variables for this analysis were job candidate experience, candidate "person" characteristics, and teacher school assignment level. The levels of candidate job experience (5 years teaching experience, 5 years of teaching experience with assistant principal experience, 5 years teaching experience with assistant principal experience and principal experience) were externally valid in that all levels met the minimum

qualifications required of principal candidates in Kentucky. To be qualified to apply for a principal vacancy, the job applicant must have three years of teaching experience and be principal certified. All simulated job candidates rated by the study participants were depicted as having five years of teaching experience and as having earned principal certification. The Watkins (1991) case study, that detected bias against more experienced job candidates for principal vacancies, resulted in job experience becoming an independent variable of interest for this investigation.

"Person" characteristics, as opposed to personal characteristics, refer to the desired characteristics of a job candidate described by the hiring organization in personnel recruitment and selection materials such as position advertisements, job descriptions, and candidate summaries used for the initial screening of job candidates. Use of this variable derived from previous personnel research (Taris & Bok, 1998). In recruitment and selection materials, hiring organizations frequently describe the ideal characteristics of the individuals they hope to hire. The ideal "person" characteristics, thus, exist in the abstract, as opposed to personal characteristics that are actually attached to an individual in an objective sense.

Taris and Bok identified communication skills and managerial competence as among the 20 person characteristics most frequently mentioned in position advertisements for managerial personnel. The levels of person characteristics (communication, management, instructional leadership) were stated qualifications for the principalship at the research sites. A description of the operationalization of the person characteristics variables appears later in this manuscript.

Blackman and Fenwick (2000) addressed the complexity of the principal's role, and the importance of communication skills, managerial competence, and instructional leadership for successful school leadership:

> Today, the school leader is expected simultaneously to be servant-leader, an organizational and social architect, an educator, a moral agent, a child advocate and social worker, a community activist, and a crisis negotiator—all while raising students' standardized-test performance. Added to these demands is the day-to-day reality of the principalship. The principal must negotiate bureaucratic minutiae, district politics, and community interactions. He or she must be able to placate and soothe parents'

concerns, while also serving as a plant manager who can get the bus schedule right. (p. 2)

The levels of person characteristics were content-validated using procedures developed by Anastasi (1976) and used in previous educational personnel research (e.g., Young, Rinehart, & Heneman, 1993; Young, Rinehart, & Place, 1989). The validation process proceeded as follows. The researchers developed operational definitions for the three levels (communication skill, managerial competence, instructional leadership) using two sources: (a) a principal profile (Jefferson County Public Schools, 1998) developed by the largest school district serving as a research site and (b) the Council of Chief State School Officers' Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996), which were the principal certification standards at the research sites. An examination of several extensive literature reviews about school leadership and the principalship (e.g., Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Cuban, 1988; Greenfield, 1995; Shoemaker & Frazer, 1987) served to identify 60 principal characteristics reflective of communication skill, managerial competence, and instructional leadership.

The researchers entered the 60 characteristics on a Q-sorting instrument and had a panel of experts composed of practicing principals (N = 6) sort the characteristics according to four categories: communication skill, managerial competence, instructional leadership, and "Do not know". Characteristics categorized unanimously by the panel as belonging to the three content domains of interest were than rated for importance (1 = Not at all Important, 5 = Extremely Important) by a pilot group of certified public school teachers (N = 24) with demographic characteristics similar to those of the actual study participants. The rated characteristics were then ranked by mean score and grouped into trios (e.g., highest rated characteristics for communication skill, managerial competence, and instructional leadership formed a trio, second highest rated characteristics formed another trio, and so forth). Finally, Tilton's (1937) overlap statistic established equivalency for items within a trio in terms of means and standard deviations. Overlap for the trios ranged from 78.3% to 89.6%, which exceeded the minimum criterion (66%) recommended by Dunnette (1966) for this type of personnel research.

The above procedures yielded content-validated person characteristics equivalent in terms of importance that were

operationalized by writing superintendent principal candidate summaries depicting job candidates who differed in terms of their person characteristics (communication skills, managerial competence, instructional leadership) and job experience. The levels of the participants' job assignment (elementary, middle school, high school) were operationalized by teacher self-reports on a biographical data form.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable was an additive composite score for teacher rating of a principal candidate, operationalized by three items measured with 5-point Likert-type scales (5 being more favorable than 1): (a) overall desirability of the candidate, (b) likelihood of recommending the candidate for an interview, and (c) likelihood of recommending the candidate for the job. The participants used the three items to rate a job candidate on a job candidate evaluation instrument.

Manipulation Checks

A final pilot test served to check the manipulations of job experience and person characteristics, and to assess reliability of the dependent variable composite score. Certified public school teachers (N = 27) completed the research instruments and, after the researchers had

collected the instruments, responded to a two-item questionnaire.

In reviewing the superintendent candidate summary instrument, each pilot participant saw only one level of candidate job experience and only one level of candidate person characteristics. The first item on the questionnaire read: "What is the principal candidate's level of administrative experience as indicated by the information on the summary?" The response options for this item were: (a) "no administrative experience," (b) "experience as an assistant principal," (c) "experience as an assistant principal and as a principal," and (d) "I do not recall." The second item on the questionnaire read: "What does the superintendent suggest is a characteristic strength of this candidate?" The response options for the second question were: (a) "communication skill," (b) "managerial competence," (c) "instructional leadership," and (d) "I do not recall."

Twenty-six participants (96%) answered the first question correctly and 24 participants (89%) answered the second question correctly. These results indicated the participants perceived the manipulations of job experience and person characteristics as intended. Coefficient alpha for the three-item composite score was .90. Given the above

pilot results, the researchers adopted the research instruments for use in the actual study without further modification.

Data Collection

The teachers, role-playing as school council members, performed three tasks: (a) completion a biographical data form, (b) review of a principal job candidate described on a simulated superintendent principal candidate summary, and (c) completion a job candidate evaluation instrument. Each teacher rated a single principal candidate. There were nine versions of the superintendent candidate summary created by the 3 x 3 crossing of the person characteristics and job experience variables. The biographical data form captured the teacher's job assignment level. The superintendent summary operationalized person characteristics and job experience. The three rating items on the candidate evaluation instrument operationalized the dependent variable (teacher rating of a principal candidate). The researchers then submitted the data to a three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Results

The sites for this research were four geographically diverse Kentucky school districts (North, South, East, West). The investigation occurred at sites where all

certified public school teachers were eligible to serve on local school councils (Van Meter, 1991). The teachers participating in the study were diverse in terms of school location (urban = 9%, suburban = 72%, rural = 19%). The participants were predominately White (93%) and female (76%), which is consistent with the national cadre of teachers (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000) indicating that most teachers in the United States are White (87%) and female (73%). The teachers ranged in age from 22 to 62 years. The mean age of the teachers, 39.6 years, was also consistent with national statistics (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000).

The participants reported teaching experience ranging from 1 to 34 years, with a mean of 11.9 years of teaching experience. Forty-two of the participants had served on school councils in the past, or were serving on a council at the time of the study. Because of the high visibility of the principal selection in Kentucky involving school councils (Lindle & Shrock, 1993), it is likely that virtually all of the study participants were aware of the principal selection role of teachers serving on school councils.

The cell means and standard deviations from the ANOVA procedure appear in Table 2. A summary of the ANOVA results

appears in Table 3. Person characteristics and school assignment

---

Insert Table 2 about here

Insert Table 3 about here

---

of the participants were not significant. However, the ANOVA detected a significant main effect [$F(2, 162) = 7.34$, $p < .001$] for candidate job experience. Calculations for omega-square, performed using procedures recommended by Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1994, p. 337), indicated that the main effect for candidate job experience explained 6% of the variance in teacher rating of a principal candidate. Six percent is a proportion of variance characterized by Keppel (1991) as a "medium effect" size (p. 74).

A post-hoc analysis, using the Tukey (HSD) procedure, detected significant ($p < .001$) mean score differences between the mean rating ($M = 7.5$) for candidates with the least job experience (5 years of teaching experience with no administrative experience) and the mean rating ($M = 9.4$) for the candidate with the most experience (5 years of teaching experience (5 years teaching experience with

experience as an assistant principal and experience as a principal). However, the above mean scores were not significantly different from the mean rating ($\underline{M}$ = 8.6) for a principal job candidate with a medium level of experience (5 years teaching experience and experience as an assistant principal).

These results revealed that teachers gave higher ratings to the most qualified candidate (i.e., the candidate with the most administrative experience) only in the case of the most extreme situation (least experienced candidate versus most experienced candidate) and failed to give preference to the more experienced job candidate in two other instances (least experienced candidate versus the medium experienced candidate and medium experienced candidate versus the most experienced candidate). Relative to these last two situations, teachers failed, holding all other job qualifications constant (e.g., principal certification, 5 years of teaching experience), to make optimal principal selection decisions. This failure would seem to cast doubt on the advisability of having teachers, who are inexperienced in selecting personnel, make principal selection decisions. Best practice (e.g., Rebore, 2001; Castetter & Young, 2000) indicates that prior job

experience should be a job qualification of the highest priority when selecting personnel.

Discussion

Principal selection has become a critical national problem due to the shrinkage of applicant pools for position vacancies and the massive retirements of principals expected to continue for the next decade (Bowles, 1990; Educational Research Service, 1998; National Association of Elementary and Secondary School Principals, 1998). Yet, there are few empirical studies about principal selection (Pounder & Merrill, 2001; Pounder & Young, 1996). The present study addressed this void in existing research. In the reform state of Kentucky, the advent of site-based decision making has complicated the task of hiring principals by empowering individuals (teachers and parents) who lack personnel training and experience to select principals (David, 1994; Lindle & Shrock, 1993). Because teachers serve only one-year council terms (Kentucky Revised Statute, 1995), frequent turnover in council membership makes training teachers in selection and applying their training to the selection task problematic. The results of this study have implications for administrative practice, selection theory, and future research.

Administrative Practice

The findings from this investigation should cause school reformers to revisit personnel policies with respect to principal selection. The study results strongly suggest that teachers on school councils, who lack administrative experience in the personnel function, have difficulty making optimal principal selection decisions that will maximally benefit the school. Failure to make an optimal principal selection decision can jeopardize school performance and school reform. Holland (1997) asserted that the selection of "the right type of leader for the [. . .] school is crucial. Selection of the wrong person can represent the greatest obstacle to school reform" (p. 96).

The findings of this study parallel those of a case study performed about school councils selecting principals in Australia. Watkins (1991) found that more experienced job candidates were disadvantaged versus less experienced candidates in the principal selection process. In the Watkins study, there was also gender bias. School councils selected only two women to fill the 31 principal hires observed. If teachers are to be involved in principal selection, the findings of this study and the Watkins study indicate teachers need preparation in the art of personnel selection to avoid bias and place a greater premium on such

important job qualifications as prior administrative experience. However, training teachers in selection does not address the frequent turnover among the teacher members of councils, which nullifies expertise gained from selection training. There would appear to be two approaches to address the above dilemma, one consistent with the existing reform mandates described earlier and one that would require modifying those mandates: (a) establish professional development in personnel selection and longer council terms for teachers or (b) place principal selection in the hands of administrators (e.g., principals, directors of personnel, and superintendents) who are trained to carry out this task.

Selection Theory and Future Research

The results of this study suggest that Dipboye's (1992) personnel selection model, developed initially for use in the private sector, is useful for framing empirical studies about personnel selection in the education sector. One postulate of the Dipboye model is that written information about job candidates used prior to the initial employment interview can result in initial impressions of job candidates that can be a decisive influence on which candidate is selected to fill the position vacancy. In this study, teachers selecting principals formed initial

impressions of job candidates based on written candidate summaries provided by the district superintendent and rated the candidates based on this information.

The impressions formed by the study participants were not precise enough, relative to prior job experience, to make optimal principal selection decisions. Holding all other job qualifications constant, the participants failed to consistently give job candidates with greater job experience preference over candidates with less experience. Given the fact that using the Dipboye model as a theoretical framework resulted in significant findings, this model would appear to be a useful framework for empirical studies that might test other postulates of the model in the educational context. Two of these postulates include: (a) factors related to the interviewer's conduct of a selection interview influence selection decisions and (b) factors related to the job candidate's performance during the selection interview influence interviewer selection decisions.

A way to design investigations to test the above postulates would be to conduct principal selection simulations with teachers, or other appropriate educational personnel, role-playing the part of interviewers, and principals and principal certified personnel role-playing

the part of candidates for a principal vacancy. Such interview simulations have resulted in significant findings relative to teacher selection (e.g., Young, 1983; Young, 1984). The task that remains is to perform such simulations relative to principal selection.

Factors investigators might manipulate in future principal selection studies include candidate age, interview performance, and gender. This last factor is especially important given the gender bias against women reported by Watkins (1991) and the documented historical male dominance of such administrative positions as the superintendency and the high school principalship (Shakeshaft, 1989). In a time of shrinking applicant pools for principal vacancies, bias against female candidates is both illegal (Arvey & Faley, 1992) and contrary to best selection practice. With respect to the high school principal, Pounder and Merrill made the following recommendation:

> Recruitment of administratively certified women could be an especially fruitful candidate pool. Because most administrator preparation programs have long reported as many or more female graduates as male graduates, qualified female administrators may be a largely

> untapped resource for filling high school principalship roles. (2001, p. 49).

Finally, future selection research should address the position of assistant principal (AP). Empirical research about recruiting and selecting APs is even more scant than the research about principals.

Study Limitations

As is the case with all research, the findings of this study are subject to limitations. This investigation involved a selection simulation. It is possible that teachers selecting principals under actual selection conditions might have rated principal candidates differently than did the participants in this research. Also, the participants in this study were from four school districts in a single reform state. It is possible that teachers from other districts in the focal state and other states, especially states not undergoing systemic school reform, might have evaluated principal candidates differently than did the participants in this study.

In conclusion, despite the limitations cited above, this study uncovered new knowledge about principal selection and did so using an innovative simulation approach that may serve to guide future selection investigations. This research also contributes to the

important task of building a base of empirical knowledge about principal selection. As discussed previously, the need for such research is pressing in light of the growing shortage of qualified principal candidates (Bowles, 1990; Educational Research Service, 1998; Fenwick, 2000; McAdams, 1998; McCormick, 1987; Pounder & Merrill, 2001).

Finally, it is hoped that the findings of this study will stimulate interest in researching principal selection in the school council and other contexts. Excellence in personnel selection is vital to the delivery of a quality educational program. As educational researchers (e.g., Harris, Monk, McIntyre, & Long, 1992; Rebore, 2001; Castetter & Young, 2000) who are expert in personnel administration have pointed out, failure to perform the personnel selection function well will cause a school, or a school district, to fail in its overall mission to adequately educate students, a consequence practitioners and scholars would agree should be avoided at all costs.

References

Anastasi, A. (1976). Psychological testing (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Arvey, R. D., & Faley, R. H. (1992). Fairness in selecting employees (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Blackman, M. C., & Fenwick, L. T. (2000, March 29). The principalship. Education Week.

Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(3), 34-64.

Bowles, B D. (1990, February). The silent crisis in educational leadership. The Education Digest, 53, 12-14.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. T. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Castetter, W. B., & Young, I. P. (2000). The human Resource function in educational administration (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. Washington, DC: CCSSO.

Cuban, L. (1988). The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in school. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

David, J. L. (1994). School-based decision-making: Kentucky's test of decentralization. Phi Delta Kappan, 75, 706-712.

Dipboye, R. L. (1992). Selection interviews: Process perspectives. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing.

Dunnette, M. D. (1966). Personnel selection and placement. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Educational Research Service. (1998). Is there a shortage of qualified candidates for openings in the principalship? An exploratory study. Arlington, VA: Author.

Fenwick, L. T. (2000). The principal shortage: Who will lead? [Monograph]. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, The Principal's Center.

Greenfield, W. D. (1995). Toward a theory of school administration: The centrality of leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31, 61-85.

Harris, B. M., Monk, B. J., McIntyre, K. E., & Long, D. F. (1992). Personnel Administration in Education (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hinkle, D., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. (1994). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Holland, W. R. (1997). The high school principal and barriers to change: The need for principal credibility. NASSP Bulletin, 81(585), 94-97.

Jefferson County Public Schools. (1998). Principal profile: Functions of leadership. Louisville, KY: Materials Production Department.

Kentucky Education Reform Act (1990). Kentucky Revised Stature § 160.345 (2) (h).

Kentucky Revised Statutes. (1995). KRSA 160.345.

Keppel, G. (1991). Design and analysis: A researcher's handbook (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kirk, R. E., (1990). Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral science (3rd ed.). New York: Brooks & Cole Publishing.

Lindle, J. C. & Shrock, J. (1993). School-based decision-making councils and the hiring process. NASSP Bulletin, 77(551), 71-76.

McAdams, R. P. (1998). Who'll run the schools? The coming administrator shortage. The American School Board Journal, 29(8), 37-39.

McCormick, K. (1987, December). The school executive shortage: How serious is it? The Education Digest, 55, 2-5.

Murphy, J., & Beck, L. G. (1994). Restructuring the principalship: Challenges and possibilities. In J. Murphy and K. S. Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

National Association of Elementary and Secondary School Principals. (1998). Over fifty percent of the principals in America will retire in the next ten years. Principal, 70(4), 65.

National Center for Education Statistics (2000). Digest of Education Statistics (U.S. Department of Education Publication No. 2001-034). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Pounder, D. G., & Merrill, R. J. (2001). Job desirability of the high school principalship: A job choice theory perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 37, 27-57.

Pounder, D. G., & Young, I. P. (1996). Recruitment and selection of educational administrators: Priorities for today's schools. In K. Leithwood (Ed.) & A. W. Hart (Section Ed.), The international handbook for educational

leadership and administration (pp. 279-308). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Rebore, R. W. (2001). Human resource administration in education (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Richardson, M. D., & Prickett, R. L. (1990). Improving principal identification and selection through school and university collaboration. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 345 334).

Shakeshaft, C. (1989). Women in educational administration (Rev. ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Shoemaker, J., & Frazer, H. W. (1987). What principals can do: Some implications from studies of effective schooling. In R. Carlson & E. Ducharme (Eds.), School improvement theory and practice (pp. 131- 176). Lanhan, MD: University Press of America.

Taris, T. W., & Bok, I. A. (1998). On gender specificity of person characteristics in personnel advertisements: A study among future applicants. Journal of Psychology, 132, 593-610.

Tilton, J. W. (1937). The measurement of overlapping. The Journal of Educational Psychology, 28, 656-662.

U. S. Department of Labor. (2000). Occupational outlook handbook, 2000-01 edition (Bulletin 2520). Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Van Meter, E. J. (1991). The Kentucky mandate: School-based decision-making. NASSP Bulletin, 75(532), 52-62.

Watkins, P. (1991). Devolving educational administration in Victoria: Tensions in the role and selection of principals. Journal of Educational Administration, 29, 22-38.

Winter, P. A., McCabe, D. H., & Newton, R. M. (1998). Principal selection decisions made by teachers: The influence of work values, principal job attributes, and school level. Journal of School Leadership, 8, 251-279.

Young, I. P. (1983). Administrators' perceptions of teacher candidates in dyad and panel interviews. Educational Administration Quarterly, 19, 46-63.

Young, I. P. (1984). The effects of interpersonal performance style in simulated teacher selection interviews. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 17, 43-51.

Young, I. P., Rinehart, J. S., & Heneman, H. G. III (1993). Effects of job attribute categories, applicant job experience, and recruiter sex on applicant job

attractiveness ratings. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 7, 55-66.

Young, I. P., Rinehart, J. S., & Place, A. W. (1989). Theories for teacher selection: Objective, subjective, and critical contact. Teaching and Teacher Education, 5, 329-336.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Actual Study Participants

Variable	n	%	Mean	SD	Range
Age (Years)			39.6	10.0	22 - 62
Dependent Children			1.1	1.1	0 - 5
Enrollment (Approx.)			827.1	269.5	430 - 1,450
Yrs Experience			11.9	9.0	1 - 34
Gender					
Female	144	76			
Male	45	24			
Race					
African American	11	6			
White American	175	93			
Other	3	1			
Marital Status					
Single	42	22			
Married	147	78			
School Location					
Urban	17	9			
Suburban	137	72			
Rural	35	19			

Table 1 continues

Table 1 Continued

Variable	n	%	Mean	SD	Range
School Level					
Elementary	63	33			
Middle	63	33			
Secondary	63	33			
Council Membership					
Served in past	28	15			
Now serving	14	7			
Never served	147	78			

N = 189

Table 2

Cell Means and Standard Deviations

LEVEL:		Elementary			Middle School			High School		
CHARAC-TERISTICS:		C	M	I	C	M	I	C	M	I
EXPERIENCE:										
Low	M	7.71	8.00	8.43	6.43	8.00	8.43	7.29	5.29	8.29
	SD	2.36	2.94	3.51	2.51	2.77	2.30	1.98	1.89	2.56
Med	M	8.00	10.14	9.86	7.29	8.00	9.43	9.29	7.71	8.00
	SD	3.06	2.19	3.44	3.20	1.83	1.99	3.20	2.87	2.83
High	M	11.00	8.29	9.43	10.29	7.29	7.71	9.43	11.29	9.86
	SD	1.15	3.55	2.51	3.45	3.04	2.87	2.70	2.06	3.34

Note. Means and standard deviations are based on additive composite scores. C = Communication Skill, M = School Management, I = Instructional Leadership.

Coefficient Alpha = .90

N = 189

n = 7

Table 3

Analysis of Variance for Teacher Rating by Person Characteristics, Job Experience, and School Level

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Person Characteristics (PC)	2	11.46	5.73	.76
Experience (E)	2	109.81	54.91	7.34* (a)
School Level (L)	2	24.98	12.49	1.67
PC X E	4	41.77	10.44	1.39
PC X L	4	2.03	.50	.06
E X L	4	36.82	9.20	1.23
PC X E X L	8	116.25	14.53	1.94
Error	162	1,212.00	7.48	
Total	188	1,555.14		

Coefficient Alpha for Three-Item Composite Score = .90

*$p < .001$

(a) $\omega^2 = .06$

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION OF PRINCIPAL SELECTION DECISIONS MADE BY TEACHERS SERVING ON SCHOOL COUNCILS

Author(s): PAUL A. WINTER AND MARY GRACE JAEGER

Corporate Source: NCPEA PAPER PRESENTATION

Publication Date: AUGUST 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Paul A. Winter	Printed Name/Position/Title: PAUL A. WINTER, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
Organization/Address: UNIV. OF LOUISVILLE, EDUC. BLDG. 335 LOUISVILLE, KY 40292	Telephone: 502-852-0417 FAX: 502-852-4563
	E-Mail Address: WINTER@LOUISVILLE.EDU Date: 8/12/02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges
UCLA
3051 Moore Hall, Box 951521
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521
800/832-8256
310/206-8095 fax

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)
PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.